

2/26/69

Dear Cyril,

Sorry not to have responded to your letter of 2/21 sooner. I was deep in preparing for a limited publication of my book COUP D'ETAT, which deals with all three assassinations and bring new material to light on that of JFK and its official "investigation". I did that today and now have three books ready for printing when that becomes possible, if it ever does. I cannot go more deeply into debt to do those thing alone any more.

C
O
P
Y
If Bud has not told you, he does have a copy of the a.m. part of the hearing, which includes your testimony. He is mimeographing it and, if you do not already have a copy, no doubt you soon will. I will be adding parts of that to the book you have not seen, POST MORTEM III: SECRETS OF THE KENNEDY AUTOPSY. I plan to add photocopies of parts of the transcript to the appendix and a discussions to the text. That I would like to get and he does not have is a few excerpts from the afternoon, that complete reflection of official xxx bankruptcy in particular.

Now, unless something happens to change my plans, I will do the second part of POST MORTEM. Unless I do, instead, LEARNING THE MARDIGRAS SOLUTION OF THE KENNEDY ASSASSINATION. I could do a first-person one, and not a la Hystein, but with the ignored, abandoned evidence that I someone turned up and turned over. It would tell what Garrison did not reveal. If I decided it is necessary to our survival....

The ultimate impact of the Washington proceedings will be up to us and we are against heavy odds. But the situation is not impossible. It depends on our finding the proper hold and the right fulcrum for intellectual judo. When you see what I have done in too-much haste in POST MORTEM III, perhaps, although you may not find the presentation to your taste, you will see the potential I see. I do not believe that in one-shot sensations this will make much difference, but if we use it the right, responsible way, we may do something with it.

There is no explaining the New Orleans decisions save in terms of paranoia, and aside from the indigenous, I fear there is that of Calandrie. He applied his at the worst possible time. Those crazy people actually feared getting fakes from DC after the court decision, after we had descriptions, and they never consult anyone who knows. There is now no chance of faking 399, for example, or the X-rays. What has happened down there since the end of the first week of December is beyond description or belief - but is nonetheless very real. I look back on it, know it happened, and still cannot believe it....I have no idea why they reacted so far ahead of schedule, failed to call witnesses they had planned calling, etc., and I can only guess. I am even less welcome than I have been. And that is pretty unwelcome!

What happened to Fitch is not what you read in the paper. They did destroy him. I gave them copies of POST MORTEM and all the documents on 12/20 and they appear to have read and understood large parts of that and of what I put into III. They did get major information from him, but it went unreported. Which is one thing we cannot blame on Garrison. Caesar did a good job.

C
O
P
Y

You may remember my candor when you asked me about Garrison and the office. I said we had to distinguish between the man and the fact. The man is too complex to attempt a simple explanation. The fact is all one way. He has not handled it at all well, has not gone into too much (because he was not prepared to, for one thing, and had none competent to for another). For example, Dad and I can both produce a witness who was a by-stander when Dean Andrews was corrupted. I have been waiting for them to call me for four weeks, believing it would do more good were I to be called. Tonight I put a call in two hours ago. There may be good reason for my not having had response, but I doubt, if I ever learn it, I will consider it reasonable or rational. But, I am certain, called earlier today. For another example, I can produce a witness who gave a signed statement to the FBI about Shaw. They have not called him. They could also subpoena the statement from the FBI. It might ignore the subpoena, but if it does it will serve to confirm. If it claims the man did not give a statement, he will be confronted with a perjury charge and will, I am confident, prove he did. He is the kind who will be able to. He worked for the CIA. He was also a police agent. And today he is making it big, will not jeopardize that.

There is so much more I cannot begin to tell you about, and I speak of only solid stuff. I just cannot tell you why these things were not done, not in any way I could accept myself.

What is right and what is wrong is so individual. I address your Ed on Sylvia. My regard for her is undiminished, as is my respect for her competence, her performance, her intelligence. For me, what she did is wrong. For her, I am confident it is not. I arranged for her to be his devil's advocate in May of 1967, and she would not be, which is peripheral. To me, what she did is wrong because she did not distinguish between the man and the fact. I fear such sticks as hers drove him the way he went. They ~~were~~ also drove him into the wrong hands.

When you have read Ed, I'd appreciate its return, indured. I have very few copies. When you'd like to read the next, let me know and I'll send a copy. And then the third. It can be sent back rate, 12 cents for the first pound, six for each additional. But please wrap it securely, with stiff cardboard. My mail is even worse than the deplorable national standard.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg